

## I.U.B.S Section of Zoological Nomenclature

### Report of Meeting and Workshop, Budapest, 19 August 1996

Present: Prof A. Minelli (Italy; Chairman) and 43 other biologists, including nine members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Secretary General and Executive Director of the International Union of Biological Sciences (IUBS).

1. The Chairman opened the meeting by welcoming all present. He explained the dual purposes of the meeting, which had been publicised in the Circulars of the V International Congress of Systematic and Evolutionary Biology (ICSEB), the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, *Biology International* and elsewhere. These were: (a) a Workshop for public discussion of the principles of the proposed Fourth Edition of the *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature*, and (b) a meeting of the IUBS Section of Zoological Nomenclature. While the main business of the meeting was the Workshop, the session of the Section had the important formal role of considering and, if thought fit, of recommending to the Executive Committee of IUBS that the principles in the proposed edition of the Code and the Constitution of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should be ratified.

2. With the approval of the meeting, Prof Minelli signed the minutes of the previous session (Amsterdam, 6 September 1991) of the Section as a correct record; these minutes had been published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (BZN 48: 293-294).

3. The Chairman explained that a secret ballot of members of the Section would be open on 19 and 21-22 August to elect new members of the Commission; the members of the Section consisted of members of the Commission who were present in Budapest and any other persons at ICSEB or the Workshop who considered themselves to be zoologists. Since the previous meeting, two members of the Commission had retired on reaching the age limit of 75 years and two others had resigned; at the end of the present Congress a further six vacancies would arise in accord with the Commission's Constitution. The Commission had concluded that at the present time it would be appropriate for the Section to elect seven new members; 33 nominations for candidature had been received and considered by the Commission, which now presented to the Section a list of 14 candidates to fill the seven vacancies. Five of these candidates were particularly recommended to the Section on the basis of their taxonomic fields of interest and their countries of origin; while the recommendations were not binding on any member of the Section in voting, it was considered that the election of these candidates would result in a membership and balance particularly advantageous to the work of the Commission. [For a report of the ballot see p. 244 below].

4. The Chairman introduced proposed amendments to the Constitution of the Commission. In accordance with Article 82a of the Code, the Constitution could only be amended by the same procedure as the Code itself (i.e. the proposals had to be published, and comments received within one year had to be taken into consideration

before approval by the Commission in a postal vote and ratification by the Executive Committee of IUBS). In the present case proposals to amend a number of Articles had been approved by the Council of the Commission in 1994 and had been circulated to other members. The amendments had been published in full, with detailed explanatory notes, in March 1995 (BZN 52: 6-11); they had also been forwarded at that time to IUBS, and their publication had been cited in the introduction to the Discussion Draft of the proposed new edition of the Code and elsewhere. No adverse comments on any of the proposals had been received.

Prof Minelli noted that of the proposed amendments to the Constitution two were major: those to Articles 3 and 11. The former provided that after serving for 18 continuous years a Commissioner would not be eligible for re-election until an interval of three years had passed. The amendments to Article 11 provided that the Commission would no longer be required to have a meeting in conjunction with every IUBS General Assembly. Although meetings at Assemblies could still be held, the President would be able to convene meetings at other Congresses (such as ICSEB) which were widely attended by zoologists, subject to the proviso that meetings of the Commission shall be held at intervals not exceeding six years. Prof Minelli emphasized that the status of IUBS as the body in authority over the Commission was not affected by any of the proposed amendments to the Constitution.

In reply to a question from a member of the Section (Dr F.C. Thompson, U.S.A.), the Chairman stated that there were no other proposals for amendments to the Constitution which involved major changes to the Commission's existing status, structure or procedures.

Prof Minelli asked if any member of the Section wished to make observations on proposed amendments to the Constitution; no remarks were made. On a motion proposed from the Chair, the Section then resolved *nem. con.* to recommend to the IUBS Executive Committee that amendments to the Constitution approved by the Commission should be ratified (explicitly including (i) the limitation to 18 years of the uninterrupted term of service of Commissioners [proposed Art. 3b], (ii) the requirement that the Commission must meet at least every six years but not necessarily at every IUBS General Assembly [proposed Art. 11a] and (iii) the abolition of the requirement [present Art. 16a(v)] that amendments to the Code and Constitution be reported to subsequent IUBS General Assemblies). It had already been agreed with the IUBS Officers that the full text of the proposed Constitution (and that of the new Code; see para. 8 below) would be circulated to the IUBS Executive Committee after the definitive postal vote by the Commission had been taken.

5. The Chairman introduced discussion of the proposed Fourth Edition of the *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature*, which was planned to come into effect on 1 January 1999 following publication in 1997. After earlier discussions by the Commission and the Section at meetings in Canberra, Maryland and Amsterdam, the Code Editorial Committee had met in Hamburg in October 1993. Distribution of a Discussion Draft began in May 1995; over 700 paper copies were produced and sent to at least 43 countries, and the text was also available

electronically. More than 500 comments were received; they were sent in batches to the Editorial Committee and some were published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. The Editorial Committee had met in Vicenza (Italy) from 24–30 June 1996 and had considered every Article in the Discussion Draft in the light of all the comments made by zoologists.

Prof Minelli invited the Chairman of the Code Editorial Committee (Prof W.D.L. Ride, Australia) to explain the steps leading to the adoption and publication of the new Code. Prof Ride outlined the procedures in the present Constitution which had been followed by the Commission and the Section in the case of the current (1985) edition. These procedures were now outdated, and in the Fourth Edition would be amended to bring them into line with present practice, which is:

(a) on request by the Commission, the Editorial Committee prepares a draft incorporating changes and makes it publicly available for discussion, as required under the Code;

(b) following a twelve-month period in which the draft is available for discussion, the Editorial Committee and the Commission meet to consider the proposals and the comments received [in the present case the Committee met in Vicenza in June 1996, as mentioned above, and the Commission was currently meeting in Budapest];

(c) proposed major changes of principle [from the previous text and from the discussion draft] are notified to the Section of Zoological Nomenclature, which is asked to support the principles agreed by the Commission and to recommend to IUBS that the final text which is accepted by the Commission should be ratified;

(d) the Commission votes, initially on major changes of principle and secondly on the complete text incorporating the agreed principles;

(e) IUBS is asked to ratify the Code text as adopted by the Commission.

The Section accepted Prof Ride's explanation without dissent and agreed to proceed on that basis. The Chairman then asked Prof Ride to guide the discussion of the proposed new edition of the Code.

6. Prof Ride drew attention to the copies of a Report by the Editorial Committee which were in the hands of members of the Workshop and Section: they also had copies of Articles 23 and 78–80 of the draft as amended in Vicenza. The Report summarized the recommended administrative procedures leading to the adoption of the Fourth Edition of the Code and major proposed nomenclatural changes to the current Code. Proposals which involved substantial changes from the current Code were indicated in the Report in some detail, together with the Editorial Committee's reasons for putting them forward. Prof Ride said that some further changes had been made by the Commission meeting during the previous two days in Budapest, and that he would draw attention to the significant ones. The Report mentioned Code Articles in which the Editorial Committee did not recommend changes previously supported by the Commission or Section. The Report did not draw specific attention to proposed changes which were essentially of an editorial nature to improve presentation and comprehension; Prof Ride emphasized, however, that all proposals were open for discussion, either in the meeting or subsequently with members of the Code Editorial Committee or Commission.

7. Prof Ride then led the meeting through the Report of the Editorial Committee and some of the proposals to which it referred. Matters mentioned during the meeting included:

(a) *Article 1 (scope of the Code)*

Scientific names of taxa above the family group were incorporated, but only to the extent that they must be uninominal and latinized, and be published in or after 1758.

Zoological genus-group names published after 1998 which are identical to generic names already published for botanical or microbiological taxa were to be treated as junior homonyms of those names. In discussion, it was pointed out that at present names for protistan taxa presented difficulties with homonymy, but it was thought that these could be overcome. It was noted that the *Index Nominum Genericorum (Plantarum)* contained 8784 names which were homonyms of zoological genus-group names, but it was not proposed that these existing homonymies be eliminated. Members of the Section pointed out that the imminent provision of comprehensive and accessible lists of generic names would facilitate the avoidance of future inter-kingdom homonymies.

(b) *Article 8 (publication to determine availability)*

The Editorial Committee had concluded that the proposal in the Discussion Draft which required that new names must be registered in *Zoological Record* was not generally acceptable, and that availability must be determined by criteria of publication. Publication of new names in durable unalterable media which are not readable by eye (such as CD-ROM) should only be acceptable under specified conditions, and electronic networks were not regarded as publications.

(c) *Article 16 (fixation of type specimens)*

It was proposed that after 1998 new species-group names would only be available if holotypes or syntypes were explicitly fixed in the original publication. If the types were preserved specimens (which was not always possible) they would have to be deposited in named and publicly accessible museums or similar institutions.

(d) *Article 23 (reversal of precedence under specified conditions)*

The Code draft proposed that a name which met stringent criteria of wide, universal and sustained use should automatically take precedence over an unused or long disused older synonym or homonym. The Commission considered that in such cases the senior name should not take precedence if it had remained unused since 1899. If the criteria were not met there might still be a case for retaining the junior name in the interest of stability, but the matter would have to be referred to the Commission for resolution under the plenary power.

(e) *Articles 30 and 31 (agreement in gender in combinations)*

The Editorial Committee had concluded that the proposal in the Discussion Draft to abandon grammatical gender agreement in species names (binomina) was not generally acceptable to zoologists, and that it should not now be pursued.

(f) *Article 42 (trace fossil genera)*

It was proposed that new genus-group names for trace fossils (ichnotaxa) should only be available if type species were fixed, as was already the case for other genus-group names.

(g) *Articles 78, 79 and 80 (power to adopt parts of a List of Available Names in Zoology, and the status of Listed Names)*

Prof P.H.A. Sneath (U.K.) noted that in bacteriology names only had status in nomenclature (i.e. were only available) if they were on an officially adopted List (or, in the case of new names, were registered by publication in the *Journal of Systematic Bacteriology*). The dates, authorship and typification of the named taxa were deemed to be as stated in the List or as registered.

Prof Ride stated that the Discussion Draft of the zoological Code contained enabling provisions so that the Commission could adopt Parts of a *List of Available Names in Zoology*. A Part would relate to a particular taxonomic field and names published in a specified period of time, and would be proposed by an international body of zoologists dealing with that taxonomic field. The List would be intended to include all known names within its scope, not only those used as valid. Adoption could only take place after processes of wide consultation; once a Part had been adopted the listed particulars relating to a name (date, authorship, typification of the nominal taxon) would be deemed to be definitive. The Discussion Draft had proposed that a name which fell within the scope of an adopted Part of the List would be available only if it were recorded in the List; this would be analogous to the practice in bacteriology. The Editorial Committee meeting in Vicenza had recommended that names not in a relevant adopted Part of the List would remain available but the Listed names would have precedence over them.

The Workshop and Section discussed the two alternatives mentioned above (names not in a relevant adopted Part of the List to be deemed either (i) not available or (ii) not to have precedence over Listed names).

Dr C. Nielsen (Denmark) proposed, and Prof W.J. Bock (U.S.A.) seconded, a motion that the Fourth Edition of the Code should prescribe the first alternative, i.e. that names which fell within the scope (taxonomic field, time span) of an adopted Part of the *List of Available Names in Zoology* but which were not in the List should be deemed to be not available. The Chairman put this motion to a vote by the Section, and it was carried *nem. con.*

8. Prof Ride proposed, and Dr C. Nielsen seconded, a motion that the Section should support the principles that had been put forward for the planned Fourth Edition of the Code, and should recommend to the Executive Committee of IUBS that the final text approved by postal vote of the Commission (subject to editorial improvements of details) should be ratified. The final text would be submitted to the IUBS Executive Committee for ratification (as with the Constitution; see para. 4 above). The motion was carried *nem. con.*

9. The Chairman thanked Prof Ride for presenting the Report of the Editorial Committee and for guiding the discussion on the draft of the Code.

10. There was some discussion of the nomenclature of ambireginal taxa, i.e. those which had been, or might be, treated under more than one Code. Such treatment sometimes led to more than one name for the same taxonomic concept, each correct under a particular Code. Two alternatives were (i) for it to be left to individual workers which Code to follow, or (ii) for appropriate taxa to be treated under the provisions of a particular Code, to which they would be assigned for nomenclatural purposes only and without taxonomic implications. It was agreed that wide consultations would be necessary to resolve the nomenclatural issues involving ambireginal organisms.

11. By invitation of Prof Minelli, Mrs J. Thorne (Biosis, U.K.) described the procedures which were currently used in the preparation of *Zoological Record*. She emphasised that the publishers (Biosis International) were a not-for-profit company, and that a facility was being developed by which the recording (or otherwise) of a taxon name could be checked on the World Wide Web free of charge. This is the Index to Organism Names, part of the *Taxonomy Resource and Index to Organism Names* ('TRITON'). A demonstration was already available. Mrs Thorne said that the assistance of workers was sought in order to make the *Record* as complete and timely as possible.

12. As Chairman, Prof Minelli asked if anybody wished to raise further business; none did. After thanking all those who had attended the Workshop and Section meeting he closed the session, and declared open the ballot for election of seven new members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

#### **Report of the ballot for election of new members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature**

The ballot was open to members of the Section of Zoological Nomenclature on 19 and 21–22 August 1996. The votes were counted by Prof A. Minelli (President of the Commission) and Commissioners W.J. Bock and D. Heppell. Fifty-nine members of the Section voted, and the following zoologists were elected as members of the Commission: Prof D.J. Brothers (South Africa), Dr W.N. Eschmeyer (U.S.A.), Dr I.M. Kerzhner (Russia), Prof S.F. Mawatari (Japan), Dr L. Papp (Hungary), Prof D.J. Patterson (Australia) and Prof Da-xiang Song (China).